The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Miss Harrison's Primitive Athens *Primitive Athens, as described by Thucydides*. By Miss Harrison. Cambridge: University Press, 1906. 8vo. 8½×5½. Pp. xii + 168. Frontispiece and 49 Illustrations (Plans and Cuts). 6s. net.

Ernest A. Gardner

The Classical Review / Volume 21 / Issue 04 / June 1907, pp 114 - 116
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00167514, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00167514

How to cite this article:

Ernest A. Gardner (1907). The Classical Review, 21, pp 114-116 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00167514

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

MISS HARRISON'S *PRIMITIVE ATHENS*.*Primitive Athens, as described by Thucydides.*

By Miss HARRISON. Cambridge: University Press, 1906. 8vo. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii + 168. Frontispiece and 49 Illustrations (Plans and Cuts). 6s. net.

THE main purpose of this book is a vindication of Prof. Dörpfeld's well-known interpretation of the passage of Thucydides (ii. 15) describing primitive Athens. The discussion of this subject deals, however, with many controversial problems of topography, mythology, and art, and almost all the discoveries of recent years are pressed into the service of the argument, whether in corroboration or merely in illustration. Thus the book serves as an interesting and readable summary of the discoveries made in Athens since the publication of Miss Harrison's *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens* in 1890, and even of much that was already found when that book was written, but was precluded by the form of the work from adequate description. But it would be doing scant justice to Miss Harrison to regard her new book mainly in this light. She expressly states in her preface that she has felt bound to write it because, 'on a question cardinal for the understanding of the early history of Athens,' she holds an opinion which has not been adequately stated by recent English writers on Athenian topography, nor, she might have added, by Germans either; for even Judeich, who certainly cannot be accused of any undue prejudice against Dörpfeld's theories in general, refuses to admit a duplication of the Pythium and Olympieum. Whatever be our views upon this most complicated question, it is a great advantage to have the Dörpfeldian view stated, as it here is, in a complete and consistent form.

It is both impracticable and superfluous to give here any criticism of the main argument: I have myself little to add to or take from the discussion of the matter which I gave in the note on Chapter IV. of my *Ancient Athens*; and the judicial summary

of the evidence given by Mr. Frazer in his Pausanias is in no way invalidated, though it may be supplemented, by more recent discoveries. But it may be noted that Miss Harrison emphasizes the point also dwelt upon by Prof. Dörpfeld in his review of Judeich's *Topography of Athens*, that the Dörpfeldian system of topography, and the interpretation of Thucydides which it implies, must stand or fall as a whole, and that it is useless to accept it in part, where other evidence is scanty or undecisive, but to reject it so far as concerns the Pythium and Olympieum, where other evidence is abundant. Miss Harrison realizes that this question of the duplication of the Pythium and Olympieum is the key to the whole position, and devotes much eloquence and ingenuity to an attempt to prove the existence of another Pythium and another Olympieum just under the Acropolis. The fact, however, remains that, while the Pythium and Olympieum by the Ilissus were among the most conspicuous and best known temples in Athens, no such second Olympieum is mentioned at all elsewhere, and that no probability, apart from the statement of Thucydides, can be adduced for its existence; and that the shrine of Apollo in the cave under the Acropolis, though it is repeatedly mentioned in literature and inscriptions, is never given the title of Pythium. Miss Harrison indeed marshalls such evidence as can be adduced for its being a Pythium with the utmost persuasiveness; but when, after due exposition, one comes to the words, 'The Pythion lies before us securely fixed, primitive, convincing,' one cannot help feeling that this confidence is excessive. If Prof. Dörpfeld's theory be correct, some such explanation of the Pythium and Olympieum will have to be accepted; but to call it convincing in itself is to overstate the case, from any point of view.

Miss Harrison concludes her book with the hope that 'Surely now at last the "Enneakrounos Episode" may be laid to sleep in peace.' How little this hope has

been justified by the event is shown by the fact that a new and very ingenious explanation of that episode has already, since the publication of Miss Harrison's book, been proposed by M. A. Malinin, who thinks he has discovered the ragged ends of the joins before and after it. Pausanias apart, it may well be doubted whether the old interpretation of the Thucydides passage would ever have been called in question. As things are, it is to be feared that those who have studied the question must remain, for the present, divided into two camps. It is a singular and perhaps a significant fact that excavations, conducted and interpreted with the utmost science and acumen, have not brought to light a single piece of evidence of which the cogency is admitted by both sides alike. And, although Miss Harrison would doubtless attribute this unfortunate state of things to the blind prejudice of those who do not accept Prof. Dörpfeld's views, the whole matter cannot so lightly be laid to rest. On the one side we have those who are so greatly impressed by the completeness and consistency of Prof. Dörpfeld's topography as to be convinced that it must be right, and that all evidence apparently inconsistent with it must be rejected or explained away; on the other we have those who prefer to weigh the evidence for each point separately, and feel unable to accept a hypothesis, however tempting, which they find, in some essential portions, to be contrary to the weight of the evidence. The question is really one of temperament rather than of argument; and, so long as the evidence remains as it is, there seems little hope for agreement between the two parties, for they have really no common basis of agreement to start from. Of this wide division Miss Harrison seems to have some consciousness when she says, 'This atmosphere of controversy, electric with personal prejudice, exhilarating as it is to the professed archaeologist, plunges the scholar in a profound dejection. His concern is not *jurare in verba magistri*—he wants to know not who but what is right.' But even if we pass over the assumption—not, I trust, in all cases justifiable—that archaeologist and scholar are mutually exclusive terms, surely Miss Harrison will admit in

her opponents what they certainly would not refuse to her and to others who take Prof. Dörpfeld's side—an honest desire to get at the truth. Our difference is only as to the method by which the truth is most likely to be reached.

To criticize Miss Harrison's arguments in detail would require a book as long as her own; and such criticism is really superfluous, since the materials for it are already available elsewhere, chiefly in the works which she quotes in her useful and convenient *Bibliography*. But one or two new details may be commented on. For instance, it is surprising to find seriously quoted, as a proof 'that the well-known Enneakrounos, Nine-spouts, was known as late as the seventeenth century to have been on the west slope of the Acropolis,' a quaint and very fanciful map, which does indeed mark a kind of swamp 'Fontana Enneacrunos' in a region, by the compass, south-west of the Acropolis, and surrounded by the 'tempio di Giove Olimpico,' the 'Palazzo di Egeo,' the 'tempio di Baccho o Leneaon,' the 'Fontana di Halirrothio,' and other objects. It is impossible to take this jumble seriously; and even if we did, from what source does Miss Harrison suppose the maker of the map to have drawn his 'knowledge' as to Enneakrounos? At the best it cannot be more than a guess suggested by a cursory reading of Pausanias, and is worthless as evidence.

Apart from controversial matter, the book is also most welcome for its account of recent investigations and for the numerous and well-chosen illustrations by which this account is accompanied. An excellent summary is given of Dr. Wiegand and Dr. Schrader's studies of the early architectural sculptures, and of the temples to which they belong; here too we have a very clear statement of Prof. Dörpfeld's new theory that the basis on which the Parthenon stands was prepared for an earlier temple, not, as he and others formerly supposed, just after the Persian wars, but in the sixth century, probably in the time of Cleisthenes. This theory of an earlier date had long been maintained, though in a different form, by Mr. Penrose: there was therefore a peculiar

pathos in a coincidence which, if I may be excused a personal reminiscence, may be here recorded. I received a letter from Prof. Dörpfeld stating his adhesion to this earlier date on the very day on which I attended Mr. Penrose's funeral. I regret that my *Ancient Athens* was published too soon for me to take advantage of a theory which, among other advantages, offers a far better explanation of the presence of the calcined drums of marble in the north wall of the Acropolis.

Finally, I have one or two personal criticisms to meet. Miss Harrison takes me to task for translating, in the Thucydides

passage, 'τὸ ὑπ' αὐτὴν' as 'the district outside it.' I admit that this was injudicious, in a passage where every word is a matter of controversy, and will correct it when I have an opportunity. Another criticism I cannot so readily accept, and this is the objection to translating 'ἱερόν' by 'temple.' I chose this as the vaguest word: if Miss Harrison can suggest a better, she will confer a boon on all who have to discuss these matters; but the word 'sanctuary,' which she suggests, appears to me inadmissible, as having a definite technical meaning equivalent to the Greek ἄστυλον.

ERNEST A. GARDNER.

TUCKER'S *LIFE IN ANCIENT ATHENS*.

Life in Ancient Athens. The Social and Public Life of a Classical Athenian from Day to Day. By T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., etc. 8vo. Pp. xiii + 212. With 2 Maps and 85 Illustrations in Text. London: Macmillan & Co. 1907. 5s.

THIS differs in many ways from the other 'Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities' which have appeared in the same series. It is not the work of a specialist and is frankly a compilation from various easily accessible books of reference. The author does not strive to compete with any of the current handbooks, but to set before the general reader who knows no Greek a clear and vivid picture of Athenian life from 440 to 330 B.C. He says, in his preface, 'the style adopted has therefore been the opposite of pedantic, utilising any vivacities of method which are consistent with truth of fact.' As a fair specimen of the vivacity, the following passage may be taken:

'In the Lycaean . . on the terrace called "The Walk," an individual with a capacious skull and a distinct fancy for personal adornment may be working solidly down, in language, not ornate, but effective, to the fundamental principles of politics, ethics, poetry, or logic. That is Aristotle, the more human and interesting Herbert Spencer of ancient Athens.'

The vivacity in fact is often little better than a rather slipshod and slangy colloquial mannerism. This appears in the occasional renderings from the Greek, as when we are told that Hippocrates, wishing to take Socrates 'to hear 'Professor Protagoras,' 'gave a tremendous thump on the door with his stick' (p. 67), which is certainly a forceful construe of πάνυ σφόδρα ἔκρουε.

The English reader is not worried with Greek equivalents, and there seems to be only one word printed in Greek in the whole book, *σεμνότης*, though here and there a few appear in italics, e.g. *existo* (p. 30) and *kalos kagathos* (p. 206). It is rather unfortunate that Latin, French, and Italian words also appear in italics. This may prove a trap to the unwary who may take a passage on p. 122 to mean that *ex cathedra* is Greek: 'His master sits on the chair which was called *cathedra* and which has given vogue to our expression *ex cathedra* for the dogmatic utterances of a master.'

In the matter of transliteration the unlearned will also be at a loss, for he will find Academe, 'Academe,' and 'Academia,' used indiscriminately, and if he looks up the 'Peiraeus' on the maps will discover that it is also spelt 'Piraeus.' It would be well to accept the latter form, as the place is known to all sailors, and appears in gazetteers without the *e*. It would also be well to retain